II.—THE *POEMA BIBLICUM* OF ONULPHUS

The attention of students of mediæval drama has often been arrested by a short dramatic text from a Vienna manuscript published by DuMéril among the examples of the liturgical Epiphany play in his *Origines Latines du Théâtre Moderne.*[1] Among the mediæval Latin plays of Epiphany this slight specimen is unique in its rhetorical form, in the names of the *dramatis personæ,* and in the absence of liturgical elements. The play is composed of thirteen leonine hexameters, which provide thirty-one speeches, each of the last ten hexameters being divided among three speakers. The first three lines, in the nature of an invitatory, are assigned to *Stella* as a speaking character, and the Magi appear under the names of *Aureolus, Thureolus,* and *Myrreolus.* The play bears no marks from the liturgy. Although the introductory rubric *Ad adorandum Filium Dei per Stellam invitantur Eoy* might serve well enough for launching a liturgical play, there is no concluding rubric to indicate a liturgical association, and the text itself contains no formulæ reminiscent of the liturgy.

Before receiving this text, then, into the history of liturgical drama, we should do well to scrutinize its credentials. DuMéril's text is an excerpt from the eighteenth-century catalogue compiled by Denis,[2] and is re-

[1] E. DuMéril, *Les Origines Latines du Théâtre Moderne,* Paris, 1849, pp. 151-152.

[2] M. Denis, *Codices Manuscripti theologici bibliothecae palatinae vindobonensis latini aliarumque occidentis linguarum,* Vol. I, Part iii, Vienna, 1795, col. 3054-3056. Denis numbers the manuscript 841. DuMéril's No. 941 is apparently a misprint.

presented as showing an independent and complete "mystère" upon the subject of the Magi.[3] Succeeding writers have added nothing to the data transmitted by DuMéril. Köppen[4] and Meyer[5] give this play no consideration. Chambers,[6] Anz,[7] and Creizenach[8] appear to derive their information exclusively from DuMéril.

In a search for further knowledge, therefore, we must first revert to DuMéril's immediate source, the catalogue of Denis. In this generous compilation we are surprised to discover that the text presented by DuMéril as an independent "mystère" is, in reality, only part of a larger poem in the form of a cycle of small dramatic pieces, to which Denis gives the collective title *Poema biblicum de generis humani Reparatione.* In view of the substantial accuracy of Denis's description of the cycle, we may well quote it *in extenso:*[9]

Fol. 30. absque inscriptione incipit *Poema* biblicum de generis

[3] DuMéril speaks of the text as follows: "Il y avait aussi dans un MS. du XIVe siècle, de la Bibliothèque de Vienne, N° 941 [misprint for N° 841], un mystère sur ce sujet, dont il ne resterait plus que l'argument, selon Denis, *Codices manuscripti theologici,* t. I, col. 3049; mais nous croirions volontiers que la pièce est complète." This statement misrepresents Denis, who in his remark (col. 3054), "Verum hujus Scenae non nisi Argumentum superest," refers not to the play before us, but to the dialogue "Inter Magos et Herodem," which in the manuscript follows immediately upon our play, and of which the manuscript preserves only part of the *argumentum,* as may be seen in my complete text printed below.

[4] W. Köppen, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Weihnachtsspiele,* Marburg, 1892.

[5] W. Meyer, *Fragmenta Burana,* Berlin, 1901, pp. 38-48.

[6] E. K. Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage,* Vol. II, Oxford, 1903, p. 51.

[7] H. Anz, *Die lateinischen Magierspiele,* Leipzig, 1905, pp. 9-49.

[8] W. Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas,* Vol. I, Halle, 1911, p. 56.

[9] Denis, col. 3054-3056.

humani Reparatione autore *Onulpho* quodam, ut patet e sequenti Procemio:

Adlardo patri uirtutibus inuigilanti
Annuit Onulphus pietatis amabile munus.
Sim licet exilis populi seu portio vilis
Rebus in extremis multo minor atque coeuis
Fascibus illatis humeros nostros oneratis,
Quas vix tangendas fragili datis ecce ferendas,
Atque panegyricum de paupere fonte rogatis
Quod sic scribatur Christi ut natale loquatur.
Hic cogor mixtum cum dramate carmen inire,
Quod sub personis alternat opus Salomonis etc.

Ad modum itaque *Cantici Cantic.* διαλόγιχως scribere decernit, idque praestat sequentibus Scenis: 1°. inter Serpentem et Evam. 2°. inter Deum Patrem et Filium. 3°. inter Prophetas et Terrigenas. 4°. inter Prophetas, Deum Patrem et Filium. 5°. inter Mariam et Gabrielem. 6°. inter Misericordiam et Veritatem. 7°. inter Coeligenas et Terrigenas, cui subjicitur Poetae Epilogus. 8°. inter Stellam et Magos, cui praemissum est metricum procemium. 9°. inter Magos et Herodem. Verum hujus Scenae non nisi Argumentum superest, deperditis omnibus, quae non exiguo fortasse numero sequebantur. Scenis singulis praefigitur Argumentum rhythmicum, ita Scenae 1.

Gloriam primi parentis euacuauit suggestio dyri serpentis.
Et dum deitatis ius expectatur auarum.
Inuidia dyaboli introiuit mors in orbem terrarum.

Scenam ult. speciminis loco exscribam: Argumentum. . . .

After the word *Argumentum* follows the text printed by DuMéril.[10] At the conclusion of this extract, Denis completes his description of the fragment as follows:

Nihil Noster aeuo suo de tribus *Regibus*, qui, si *Onulphus* Monachus est, qui in vitam *Popponis* Abb. *Stabulensis* autore *Everhelmo* apud *Bollandum* T. II. Jan. ad diem 25. p. 638. praefatur, ad medium Sec. XI, et Coenobium *Blandiniense* prope *Gandavum* pertinet. Certiora dicent fortasse, apud quos integrum *Onulphi* Poema fuerit, de quo nil Leyserus, nec, quod sciam, alii.

[10] DuMéril, pp. 151-152.

The information communicated by Denis may best be interpreted through the *Poema biblicum* itself, of which I offer a text based upon the manuscript:[11]

<POEMA BIBLICUM DE GENERIS HUMANI REPARATIONE>

Adlardo patri uirtutib*us* inuigilanti
Annuit Onulphus pietatis amab*i*le mun*us*.

P*ro*HEMIUM.

Sim lic*et* exilis pop*u*li seu portio uilis
Rebus i*n* ext*re*mis m*u*lto minor atq*ue* coeuis,
Fascibus illatis hum*er*os n*ost*ros oneratis,[12]
Q*ua*s uix tangendas fragili datis ecce f*er*endas,
Atq*ue* panegyricu*m* d*e* paup*er*e fonte rogatis
Q*uo*d sic scribat*ur* Xp*ist*i ut natale loquatur.
Hi*nc* cogor mixtu*m* cu*m* dramate[13] carm*en* inire,

[11] In preparing this text I have had the great advantage of consultations with Professor Grant Showerman and Professor E. K. Rand, to whom I am deeply grateful for generous assistance. To Professor Rand I owe numerous editorial suggestions, a few of which I have been able to acknowledge specifically below. Professor Rand, however, should not be held responsible for any errors that I may have committed in my use of his suggestions.

The manuscript is described by Denis, col. 3049-3058, and in *Tabulae codicum manu scriptorum in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi Asservatorum*, Vol. I, Vienna, 1864, p. 185. The press-mark of the manuscript given by Denis as 841, is now "1054. [Theol. 452]." Cod. 1054 is a miscellany of 40 folios, containing some ten separate entries written in hands of the twelfth and fourteenth centuries. The entry with which we are concerned is written in double columns in a hand of the fourteenth century, and occupies the lower two-thirds of folio 30 recto and all of folio 30 verso. In my text, asterisks mark the beginning and end of the part printed, from Denis, by DuMéril.

[12] In the manuscript this word is preceded by a false stroke.

[13] Ms. diamate.

Q*uo*d s*u*b p*er*sonis alternat opus Salomonis,
Necdu*m* dep*re*ndi q*ua*muis hoc scema cane*n*di
Q*uod* p*er*sonar*um* facit alternatio clarum
Datq*ue* decus rebus, grandeuo iu*n*ct*us* epheb*us*
Par p*er*sona pari cu*m* d*e*poscit sociari
P*er*sone int*er*du*m* comite p*er*sona repugnat,
Astute prauus satagit cu*m* fallere Dauus,[14]
Iratusq*ue* Chremes tumido d*e*litigat ore,[15]
Id genus *et* pl*ur*a comitis potius placit*ur*a
Que fidei sane doctrina stud*et* rep*ro*bare.
S*ed* qui p*re*clare uis p*er*sonas uariare
Has du*m* co*m*ponis more*m* gerito Sal*omo*nis,
Nam satyram q*uod* olet, me*n*s Xp*isto* d*e*dita nol*et*.
Virgo parit Xp*istu*m, res ta*n*ta die*m* sac*ra*t istu*m*,
Cui*us* natalem persona pudica loquat*ur*.
Om*n*is ab h*o*c festo uates gentilis abesto,
Pindar*us*, Alceus, me*n*dose pulch*er* Homer*us*.
Nec macule*n*t fucis p*re*sentis gaudia lucis,
S*ed* p*re*stent de te, D*eus*, argum*e*nta p*ro*phete,
Ac p*at*riarcharu*m* concurru*n*t d*ic*ta tuor*um*.
Secla q*u*oq*ue* ex Ade ueteris p*er*euntia clade
Deplore*n*t flendo, mis*er*endo, *com*patiendo,
P*er* lacrimas quor*um*, Ih*es*u, miser*er*e reor*um*,
Et p*er* Mariam pie cu*m* uacuaueris Euam,
Antydoto[16] leni gustu*m* *com*pesce ueneni.

Argum*e*ntum p*ri*mu*m*:

Gl*ori*am p*ri*mi p*ar*entis
Euacuauit suggestio dyri serpentis;

[14] Ms. clauus.
[15] Horace, *Ars Poetica*, line 94.
[16] The manuscript appears to have antydotū, altered to antydoto.

Et du*m* deitatis ius expectat*ur* auarum,
Inuidia dya*boli* introiuit mors i*n* orbe*m* te*r*rarum.

Serpens: <fol. 30^r, col. 2>

Qui te plantauit   lignu*m* uitale negauit,
Q*uo*d si gustares,   bona u*e*l mala tanta negares.
Vim q*uo*q*ue* magnor*um*   posses equare deor*um*.

Eua:

Legem dictauit,   qui uos a*nim*ando creauit,
Ut no*n* gustet*ur*   medius q*ui* fruct*us* h*ab*etur,
Ne cu*m* gustatur,   q*uo* [17] uiuim*us* h*oc* p*er*imat*ur*.

S*er*pe*n*s:

Saluat saluificu*m*,   nouit nocuisse nociuu*m*.
Nec ualet e*ss*e malu*m*   uirtutis ma*n*d*er*e malu*m*.

Eua:

Parce*n*du*m* statui, q*ui*a re*m* u*ir*t*us* comitat*ur*.
Nec fruar absq*ue* uiro   re q*ua*m f*ru*it*ur*a req*ui*ro;
Et cibus iste p*ro*bus   stab*i*t i*n* *com*mu*n*e duob*us*
Dum liquet h*oc* tali bo*na* u*e*l mala p*o*sse notari.

Argum*en*tum:

Hoc inobedientie reatu i*m*mortalitate*m* homo exuit,
Morte*m*q*ue* i*n* om*n*es ia*m* posteros t*ra*nsmisit,
Cui*us* lapsum D*eu*s P*ate*r mis*er*atus ab alto
P*ro* rep*ar*ati*on*e ipsius t*ra*ctat *cum* Deo Filio.

D*eu*s P*ate*r:

Nate, mee uires   *et* mag*ni*fice*n*tia diues,
Cernis *con*fundi   q*uia* crimi*n*e clymata mu*n*di.
Hu*n*c rep*ar*es mecu*m*   q*ui* corru*it*; arbit*ror* eq*uu*m.

[17] Ms. q*uod*.

Deus Filius:
Res manet ad cunctas tecum mihi iuncta uoluntas.
Per me decerne quecumque gerenda superne,
Quidquid et est infra uel quidquid respicit extra.

Deus Pater:
Testantes de te patriarche necne prophete
Hii premittantur, mundoque futura loquantur,
Post quorum aduentum mitteris secla redemptum.

Deus Filius:
Pneumate de nostro uatum perflabitur ordo,
Peccati morbis per quos si non caret orbis,
Perfectam faciam, te disponente, salutem.

Argumentum:

Patriarche cum prophetis ad terrigenas mittuntur,
Sed ab hiis non recipiuntur.

Prophete:
Misit rex celi nos uulnera uestra mederi,
Res etenim uestra prorsus perit intus et extra;
Absque salute ulla cordis languetque medulla.

Terrigene:
Languida mens egri satis indiget ipsa mederi.
Quos sanos scitis frustra curare uenitis,
Nam non languemus sana qui mente uigemus.

Prophete:
Per mali morsum postquam ruit Eua retrorsum,
Ira necis dire passim porrexerat[18] ire.

[18] Ms. perrexerat.

Mortif*er*e pestis   p*re*ssi sic cladib*us* estis.
Terrigene ad prophetas D*omi*ni: <fol. 30^{v}, col. 1>
Vulnus id obduxit satis inueterata cycatrix;
Q*ui*dq*uid* *et* est ho*minu*m   po*st* da*m*pna manet recidiuu*m,*
Nullaq*ue* splendet ita   uel*ud* h*ec* clarissi*m*a uita.

Arg*umentum:*

P*r*oph*et*e Deo que*m* nullu*m* latet sec*re*tu*m* audita renu*n*cia*n*t atq*ue* redim*en*do ho*mi*ni *con*siliu*m* *in*staurat*ur* D*omi*ni.

P*r*oph*ete:*
Reb*us* i*n* hu*m*a*n*is   sic p*re*ual*et* error i*n*anis,
Ut bona p*ra*ua pute*n*t   ueluti mala r*ec*ta refute*n*t,
Et p*re*t*er* mu*n*du*m*   nil *cre*dant e*ss*e secu*n*dum.

Deus P*at*er ad p*r*oph*et*as:
Dure c*er*uicis   datur h*ec* si plebs i*n*imicis
Inpie p*er*detur;   s*ed* nu*n*c ne tota necetur,
Ira*m* suspendi,   quia sit te*m*pus mis*er*endi.

D*eu*s Filius:
Si, P*at*er, intendis   pietatis reb*us* agendis,
Est opis id g*ra*ue me q*ue*q*ue* gerenda patrare.

D*eu*s P*at*er:
In t*er*ris t*ib*i mat*er* erit noua, V*ir*go Maria,
Illa q*uod* ut sciscat,   Gabriel*is* dogmata discat.

D*eu*s Fili*us:*
Pareo p*r*eceptis,   *et* tu, P*at*er, a*n*nue ceptis,
Maiestate [19] pari   q*uia* constat nos sociari.

[19] Ms. maiestati.

Arg*um*e*ntum*:

Gabriel archang*elus* ad u*i*rgine*m* Maria*m* destina*tur*,
Nat*iui*tas q*uia* Xp*ist*i p*er* eum nunciatur.

Gabriel archan*gelus:*

O Maria, uale!   templu*m* D*omi*ni speciale!
Pulc*hra* maris stella,   s*ed et* intemerata puella!
Innuba mat*er* eris,   s*ed* m*at*er u*i*rgo maneb*is*.

Maria:

Qual*ite*r absq*ue* uiro   ualeam gen*er*are requiro;
Nec dubitans q*ue*ro,   q*uod* posse g*er*i pie spero
Hui*us* iura rei,   s*ed* su*m* studiosa doc*er*i.

Gabriel arch*angelus:*

Inbuet int*er*nu*m*   pectus tibi pneuma sup*er*nu*m;*
Sicq*ue* Dei ueri   gaudebis prole repleri.
P*ost* p*ar*tu*m* p*r*olis   n*ec* habebis da*m*pna pudoris.

Maria:

Annuat ancille   m*ihi* rer*um* conditor ille,
Hui*us* iura rei   ualea*m* quo s*anct*a mereri,
Atq*ue* stat*us* me*n*tis   formet*ur* reb*us* age*n*dis.

Argume*n*tu*m*:

Xp*ist*o nato, Mi*sericordi*a *et* Veritas obuiaueru*n*t sibi;
Iusticia *et* Pax osculate s*unt*.

Mi*sericordi*a:

Per Xp*ist*u*m* natu*m*   uideo mu*n*du*m* gratulatu*m,*
Et qu*i*a perpendi   uenisse diem miserendi
Om*ni* p*ro* mu*n*do[20]   pietatis a*m*ore red*u*ndo.

[20] The manuscript may read p*r*ome*n*do.

Veritas:

Hec p*re*sens etas   meruit res c*er*nere letas,
Verbu*m* na*m*q*ue* Dei   nu*n*c stillaba*n*t quia celi.
V*era* fide*s* c*re*scat,   fallacia cu*n*cta facescat.

I*us*ticia:

Qui bona formauit   me I*us*ticia*m* uocitauit.
Iussit *et* ip*s*e sequi   nati uestigia Xpisti,
Ut mala pella*ntur*,   f*ra*us, ira, dol*us* sopia*ntur*.

Pax:

Sim comes ut tecu*m*   prors*us* res po*s*tulat eq*uum*,
Et quo*niam* Xp*ist*i   gressus comitata fuisti,
Mecu*m* *con*iura   *com*pon*ere* fed*er*a pura.

Argum*en*tu*m*:

N*atiuita*tem Xp*ist*i cu*m* h*ec* leta p*ro*sequu*ntur*,
Int*er* celigenas *et* t*er*rigenas u*er*ba d*e* pace oriu*ntur*.

Celigene:

Acten*us* i*m*mite*m*   tenu*erun*t s*ec*ula litem.
S*ed* cu*m* u*ir*go pa*r*it   uerbu*m* q*uod* cu*n*cta cre-
auit,
Pax q*uo*q*ue* u*er*a red*it*,   lis i*n*ueterata reced*it*.

T*er*rigene:

Maiestate Dei   coguntur cu*n*cta moueri
N*am* cu*m* uirgo parit,   cu*m* pax lite*m* sup*er*arit,
Re licet i*n*sueta   p*ro*ced*un*t t*em*p*or*a leta.

Celigene:

Res cu*m* mira dat*ur*   null*us* u*est*r*u*m moueatur.
Hic pu*er* a uobis   Bethlem cernet*ur* in oris
Cui cunas t*ant*um   p*re*sepia da*n*t a*nim*antum.

Te*rr*ige*n*e: <fol. 30^{v}, col. 2>

Morte quide*m* uicta d*e*itas iuge sit b*e*ned*i*c*t*a;
S*ed* pia dona D*e*i p*ro*p*er*abim*us* ecce tueri,
Ut rege*m* regum p*er* nos sciat orb*is* i*n* euu*m*.

POETA *SUB* APOSTR*O*PHA FAC*it* EPYLOGUM.

Hiis su*m* p*er*sonis Xp*istu*m *tibi*, Domne, locut*us*,
Palle*n*tes hederas, nenias [21] sp*er*ne*n*s *et* Hyberas,
Q*ua*s q*ui* st*ultus* amat X*pisto* p*re*ca*n*do reclam*at*,
S*ed* q*uia* nil t*ri*ste, P*ate*r alme, dies h*abe*nt iste,
Ia*m* nu*n*c me*n*te pari nos *con*ue*n*it exhilarari,
P*ecc*a*t*isq*ue* mori, uirtutib*us* atq*ue* renasci.
S*ed* q*uia* temp*us* abit, finiri sermo rogabit,
Sit licet eg*re*giu*m* nu*m*qua*m* te, Xp*is*t*e*, tacere,
Qui cu*m* P*at*re D*e*o uiuis s*in*e te*m*po*r*is euo
Iure coete*r*no cu*m* pneumate necne sup*er*no.

PERSONE D*e* EPYPHANIA D*omi*NI.

P*ro*HEMIU*m*.

Prodiit ex stella lux h*ec* radia*n*te nouella,
Xp*istu*m mo*n*stra*n*do, ge*n*tiles atq*ue* uocando.
H*ec* neq*ue* nu*n*c orbi recolet*ur* laude minori,
Q*ua*m q*ue* [22] nasce*n*tem ia*m* uiderat om*n*ipote*n*tem,
Rex un*us* q*ua*muis sibi *con*signarit utra*m*uis.
Illa dedit Xp*istu*m, h*ec* gentes traxit ad ip*su*m.
Plebi Iudee celestia tu*n*c patuere;

[21] Since Professor Rand has called my attention to Ovid, *Fasti*, vi, 519, Appulerat ripae vaccas Œtæus Hyberas, I can suggest the emendation *uaccas*.

[22] Ms. q*ua*mq*ue*.

Stella *sed* absentes   traxit nunc preuia gentes,
Et cu*m* d*e* longe   pop*ulus* *con*uenit uterq*ue*
Diu*er*sus dudu*m*   p*ar*ies respondet i*n* unu*m*.
Vocib*us* hinc eque   parib*us* uen*er*entur utreq*ue*,
S*ed* cu*m* personis   alternatim speciosis
Del*ec*tat[23] rursum   scribendi[24] tend*er*e cursum,
Voce s*u*b alterna   resonet q*uo*[25] laus hodierna
Ex re d*iu*ina   cui sunt mysteria trina:
Regu*m* dona triu*m*   baptisma † uonīs † aq*ua* ui-
nu*m*;[26]
Que tria cu*m* dant*ur*   u*ir*tute*m* in nos op*er*ant*ur*;
N*am* p*er* *sanctorum*   tria mystica dona magorum
P*ri*micias gentis   pietas uocat om*nipoten*tis;
N*os*tra mala exti*n*guit   cu*m* se baptismate ti*n*git,
Resq*ue* p*ar*at letas   laticu*m* signa*n*do met*re*tas.
Sicq*ue* dies unus   cu*m* dat *tri*plicabile mun*us*,
Multiplicata salus   n*os*tros *con*currit i*n* usus.

Argum*en*tu*m*:

*Ad adorandu*m* Filiu*m* Dei *per* Stella*m* i*n*uita*n*tur Eoy.

[1] Stella, Aureolus, Thureolus, Myrreolus.[1]

Stella:

Nato ferte Dei   redolencia thura, Sabei,
Et iunctis Arabis   exotica plebs p*ro*perabis,
Auru*m* cu*m* myrra   tellus sudabis eoa.

[23] Professor Rand suggests the conjectural emendation Me liceat.
[24] Ms. scribende corrected to scribendi.
[25] Ms. *qua*.
[26] My difficulty in this line may be due to a scribal error.
- Reprinted from Denis by DuMéril.
[1-1] Omitted by DuMéril. Before the word *Stella* Denis interpolates the word *Interlocutores*.

Aureol*us:*
Q*ui*d p*ar*at h*ec* stella?

Thur*eolus:*
Stupeo.

Myr*reolus:*
Lux ista nouella!

Aur*eolus:*
H*ec* nimis ig*n*escit.

Thur*eolus:*
Sol ced*it*.

Myr*reolus:*
Lu*n*a facesc*it*.

Au*reolus:*
O q*uam* ca*n*desc*it*.

Thur*eolus:*
Frix [27] pall*et*.

Mir*reolus:*
Taur*us* [28] ebescit.

Aur*eolus:*
O q*uam* fer*u*esc*it*.

Thur*eolus:*
Iouis horr*et*.

Myr*reolus:*
Mars teneb*r*esc*it*.

Aur*eolus:*
Ia*mque* mag*is* c*r*escit.

Th*ureolus:*
Leo pall*et*.

Myr*reolus:*
V*ir*go tabescit.

[27] *I. e.*, Phryx.
[28] Ms. Laurus.

Aureolus:
Hec regem regum monstrat.

Thureolus:
Dominumque.

Myrreolus:
Hominemque.

Aureolus:
Hinc inquiratur.

Thureolus:
Veneretur.

Myrreolus:
Nonne colatur?

Aureolus:
Aurum sumamus.

Thureolus:
Seu thus.

Myrreolus:
Myrramque feramus.

Aureolus:
Aurum sit regi.

Thureolus:
Domino thus.

Myrreolus:
Myrra hominique.

Aureolus:
Stellam sectemur.

Thureolus:
Precedit nos.

Mirreolus:
Comitemur.*

Argum*e*ntu*m*

Ap*u*d H*er*od*em* reg*em* Iud*e*or*um* natu*m* regem regu*m* i*n*uestigat sollicitudo magor*um*. Magi . . .[29]

The content of the cycle of dialogues may be indicated schematically as follows:

Procemium.

(1) Argumentum.
Dialogus: Serpens et Eva.

(2) Argumentum.
Dialogus: Deus Pater et Deus Filius.

(3) Argumentum.
Dialogus: Prophetæ et Terrigenæ.

(4) Argumentum.
Dialogus: Prophetæ, Deus Pater, et Deus Filius.

(5) Argumentum.
Dialogus: Gabriel et Maria.

(6) Argumentum.
Dialogus: Misericordia, Veritas, Justitia, et Pax.

(7) Argumentum.
Dialogus: Cœligenæ et Terrigenæ.

Epilogus.

Procemium.

(8) Argumentum.
Dialogus: Stella, Aureolus, Thureolus, et Myrreolus.

(9) Argumentum. [Magi apud Herodem.]

[29] Thus the fragment ends at the bottom of the second column of fol. 30v. At the top of fol. 31r another hand begins a separate work under the rubric: Incipit prologus super commento Apocalipsis.

The fragment preserves, then, eight dialogues, and part of the *argumentum* preceding a ninth dialogue. The first seven dialogues by themselves seem to constitute a complete and separate play, for the series is introduced by a *prooemium* and is concluded by an *epilogus*. The second *prooemium* was probably followed by a considerable number of dialogues on subjects from the New Testament, and the complete text may well have extended to considerable length. The succession of subjects in the fragment is not precisely paralleled in any Latin or vernacular play known to me.[30]

As to the authorship of the cycle we have only the evidence of the text itself. It appears that for the sake of a certain Adlardus Pater a poet named Onulphus composed a dramatic poem upon a Christian subject in the manner of the *Canticum Canticorum Salomonis*. The identity of the author is not easy to determine. To the literary history of the middle ages are known two personages bearing the name Onulphus:

(1) Onulphus Blandiniensis was a Benedictine monk at Blandigny (Blandinium, Blandinberg,), near Ghent. He collaborated with Abbot Everhelmus († 1069) in writing the life of Saint Poppo, abbot of Stavelot (1020-1048). Thus Onulphus Blandiniensis had associations with two Belgian monasteries.[31]

(2) Onulphus Spirensis is known to us only as the author of the *Colores Rhetorici*, a fragment preserved in a twelfth-century manuscript, to which is attached the following colophon: *Finiunt rethorici colores ab Onulfo*

[30] As to the formation of Old Testament cycles see Hardin Craig, *The Origin of the Old Testament Plays*, in *Modern Philology*, Vol. x, pp. 473-487.

[31] See A. Potthast, *Bibliotheca Historica Medii Aevi*, Vol. II, Berlin, 1896, p. 1532; U. Chevalier, *Répertoire des Sources Historiques du Moyen Age: Bio-Bibliographie*, Vol. II, Paris, 1907, col. 3420.

Spirensi magistro beatae memoriae editi. Wattenbach assigns the writing of the *Colores Rhetorici* to the middle of the eleventh century.[32]

From the information at my disposal I should feel no certainty in identifying the Onulphus of our dramatic fragment with either of the writers mentioned above. One is tempted to identify Adlardus Pater of the dedication with Adalardus I († 1033/4) or Adalardus II († 1082), each an abbot of St. Trond, Belgium,[33] and hence to assign the fragment itself to the Belgian Onulphus Blandiniensis. On the other hand, certain literary aspects of the fragment are suggestive of the *Colores Rhetorici.* The knowledge of Horace and Terence shown by the author of the *Poema Biblicum,* and his mention of Pindar, Alcæus, and Homer, recall the classical learning displayed by Onulphus Spirensis in the *Colores Rhetorici.*

Whoever the author of the fragment may have been, the dramatic cycle before us hardly lies in the main channel of mediæval dramatic development, for it betrays no connection with either the liturgical or the vernacular cycles. Since, moreover, it bears no evidence of scenic production, it may be regarded as an isolated academic exercise of a pious rhetorician of classical attainments, and as such it brings to mind the more imposing dramatic achievement of Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim.

KARL YOUNG.

[32] Concerning Onulphus Spirensis I have no information beyond that given by W. Wattenbach, *Magister Onulf von Speier,* in *Sitzungsberichte der königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin,* 1894, Part I, pp. 361-386, and by M. Manitius, *Zu Onulfs von Speier Rhetorici Colores,* in *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde,* Vol. xx (1894), pp. 441-443. These references are used by Chevalier (*Répertoire,* Vol. II, col. 3420), who, however, assigns Onulphus to the twelfth century.

[33] Chevalier, Vol. I, col. 27.